

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN**

BRENDA KOEHLER, KELLY PARKER,
LAYLA BOLTEN, and GREGORY HANDLOSER,

Plaintiffs,

Case No. 13-CV-885

v.

MINUTE SHEET

INFOSYS TECHNOLOGIES LIMITED, INC.,
and INFOSYS PUBLIC SERVICES, INC.,

Defendants.

Hon. David E. Jones, presiding.

Deputy Clerk: Tony Byal

Type of proceeding: TELEPHONIC STATUS CONFERENCE

Date: September 29, 2016 at 11:00 AM

Court Reporter: FTR Gold

Time Commenced: 11:01:08

Time Concluded: 11:32:56

Appearances: **Plaintiffs:** Daniel A. Kotchen, Michael von Klemperer

Defendants: Ellen E. Boshkoff, Rozlyn M. Fulgoni-Britton

Comments:

Defendant raises a couple issues. Thinks new witnesses are important to the case and had additional concerns regarding how they impact other discovery. Two of the witnesses are identifying a former Infosys employee who engaged in misconduct. Has no way to rebut this statement unless witnesses are deposed.

Court states this issue may be justification to give defendants additional time for summary judgment briefing.

Defendant raises scheduling issue. Plaintiff subpoenaed third party for records, and defendant submitted brief declaration stating contract was terminated with that third party. Working on expert report, which is due November 14. This expert report needs to respond to summary judgment motion filed by plaintiff. Will be working on this report and deposing new witnesses during this time, which creates logistical problems. Proposed streamlined schedule to plaintiffs counsel, but they did not agree with it. Defendant states expert report is most critical piece of

evidence for case.

Plaintiff states they did not agree with timing of defendant's proposed schedule and wants to make sure the streamline is an orderly process. Plaintiff will try to work out this problem with defendant.

Court advises parties are to submit proposed schedules to the Judge Jones' PO email by **Thursday, October 6, 2016 at 11:00 AM** if they are unable to resolve this issue.

Plaintiff raises a couple of issue regarding discover, which they will try to work out with defendant. Plaintiff also raises confidentiality issues. Defendants' briefing included documents that are designated as confidential by plaintiff.

Court advises parties unless there is a good reason not to, documents are made public. Parties agree this will not be an issue.

Court advises parties to consider consenting to magistrate judge jurisdiction to resolve case due to time constraints.

Telephonic status conference set for Thursday October 6, 2016 at 2:00 Central.